DISARMAMENT

Newsletter of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament Affairs

Volume 12, Number 2 March- April 1994

In this issue

-CTBT negotiations in Geneva
-Fissile material cut-off
-Disarmament Commission opens
-Special Conference on Biological Weapons Convention
-Inhumane Weapons Convention review
-African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone
-Security in Central Africa

See also

CD/NTB...Selected documents and working papers in brief *and* ‡‡ **1994 Calendar-update on back page** ‡‡

Test ban treaty talks set steady pace of activity

Much international private and public expectation is pinned on the speedy conclusion of a draft comprehensive test ban treaty in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Its Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban began its work in 1994 by developing an organizational apparatus to tackle the many complex aspects of the negotiations and has maintained a steady and busy pace of activity during the first part of the Conference's session, which ended on 31 March. That represents the clearest sign that the momentum begun by the decision to negotiate a test ban taken last year has not been lost.

The Conference and its Ad Hoc Committee has recessed until 16 May, after which work will continue until 1 July. Proposals are circulating to allow the Ad Hoc Committee to continue its work during the intersessional period from 2 to 23 July. The third part of the Committee's session meets officially from 25 July to 7 September. Still to be decided is how the Conference will advance the CTBT negotiations during the long break after 7 September until the start of the 1995 session.

As far as the time frame is concerned, we support the call to conclude a CTBT before the NPT review and extension conference in 1995.....the view expressed by many of us on the desirability of (this time frame) does represent a general feeling that there is a link between a CTBT and the NPT.—Ambassador Brotodiningrat of Indonesia at the 670th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament on 10 February 1994.

Timing and the 1995 NPT Conference

A substantial number of delegations expressed their views in plenary sessions of the Conference on Disarmament on the key issues of the timing of the conclusion of the treaty and the relevance of the current negotiations to the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

Members of the Group of 21 (non-aligned and others) have consistently supported concluding the CTBT this year. They have reaffirmed the close relationship between the future CTBT and the 1995 Conference of States Party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The United States has said that the CTBT should be concluded "at the earliest possible time". The United Kingdom favoured as rapid a conclusion of a treaty as feasible without compromising the treaty's eventual effectiveness. France has focused on the elements necessary for the adoption of an effective CTBT. The Russian Federation has said it wishes to ensure that negotiations are largely completed by spring 1995. China said it would join in an effort to conclude a CTBT no later than 1996.

It is not appropriate to set artificial deadlines, but we consider it desirable to be able to reach a stage, by spring 1995, where we can have a prospect of a successful conclusion of the treaty negotiations at hand."
—Ambassador Yoshitomo Tanaka of Japan at the 675th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament on 17 March 1994.

....more on a CTBT

94-20968

CTBT in progress

In addition to the issues of the timing of the conclusion of the treaty and its relationship to the NPT, many members and non-members of the Conference* have addressed the formal plenary meetings on a wide variety of CTBT negotiating issues. Remarks have been concentrated on the scope of application of the future treaty, verification and compliance, institutional arrangements, sanctions in case of non-compliance, conditions for the entry into force and duration/ review of the treaty. While space in this column does not permit a look at all these items, a few general trends are outlined below.

In the Ad Hoc Committee, twenty working papers have been presented during the first part of the Conference's session, including three submitted by the Australian delegation at the close of the first part of the talks. In its papers, Australia puts forward a series of draft elements for the treaty. The Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, Ambassador Miguel Marín Bosch of Mexico, plans sometime in June to use the substantial amount of written proposals in order to set down treaty language in draft form.

Scope

Several issues relating to the scope of the future treaty have received considerable attention in the Ad Hoc Committee and its Working Group 2 on legal and institutional issues (Chairman: Ambassador Ludwik Dembinski of Poland). Many delegations have underlined the fundamental need to reach agreement on the scope of application of the future treaty in order to progress in other essential areas of the negotiations, especially in the area of verification and compliance and the modalities for implementation. Among the concerns surrounding the scope of application are the ways to reflect the geographical breadth of the prohibition; the question of a ban on nuclear explosions not intended for military purposes, and the need for or the practicability of prohibiting preparations for nuclear tests. The latter proposal was introduced in the Swedish draft treaty (CD/ 1232 of 6 December 1993). Most delegations have called for further discussion of that last issue.

Verification and compliance

In Working Group 1 on verification and compliance (Chairman: Ambassador Wolfgang Hoffmann of Germany), most delegations have emphasized that a seismic monitoring system will be the cornerstone of the future CTBT verification regime. Moreover, the need to use various other non-seismic related techniques was stressed as well. In addition to the commonly shared view that some form of routine and challenge on-site inspection will be necessary, delegations have leaned towards consideration of supplemental monitoring systems, such as, hydroacoustic monitoring and atmospheric radionuclide surveillance. Those systems have been viewed as effective back-up to a seismic monitoring system when doubts about compliance might arise. They are relatively inexpensive to operate. The major expenses incurred, after their initial start-up, are connected to the operation of the communications network. Other types of technologies are under consideration as well.

A number of presentations by experts connected to their national delegations, as well as contributions from the World Health Organization (WHO), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), are planned during the second part of the Conference's session on non-seismic verification, on-site activities and transparency measures.

Institutional issues

While decisions must be taken on the scope of the treaty before agreement can be reached on an organization for the oversight of a CTBT, the two basic tenets that elicit agreement are that the organization should not rival in size or complexity the one under preparation in The Hague for the Chemical Weapons Convention, and that it must be cost-effective. The role of the IAEA in this regard must still be clarified. While some delegations would like the Agency to take full responsibility for implementing the terms of the future agreement, others envisage a more limited role for the Agency within the framework of a dedicated CTBT organization.

*There are 38 members of the Conference and so far in 1994 47 non-members are participating in its work.

* * *

From 14 to 16 March this year in Tokyo, experts and officials from 24 countries participated in a **Workshop on CTBT Verification**, hosted by Japan, which, among other things, acquainted workshop participants with Japanese seismic monitoring technologies relevant to an international seismic monitoring system (ISMS). Ambassador Yoshitomo Tanaka highlighted some aspects of the workshop in a statement to the Conference on Disarmament on 24 March. For further information, contact the Japanese delegation to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

READEX
FICHE

Selected documents and working papers in brief
Conference on Disarmament
CD/NTB....

****

Please note that while CD/...series documents are available to the public, CD/NTB/WP...series are not. These short summaries are offered for information only and readers interested in copies must address themselves to the sponsoring delegation.

****

Group of 21 presents further views on key elements of a CTBT. Following on its joint statement presented on 1 December last year (CD/1231), which gave guidelines for the CTBT negotiations, the Group of 21 has tabled its views on the structure and the scope of the treaty; on verification and compliance issues; on the establishment of CTBT organization; and on the provisions governing entry into force (CD/1252).

Sweden and the United States on radionuclide monitoring. Sweden submitted a working paper on the technical specifications for the establishment of a system for the International Surveillance of Atmospheric Radioactivity (ISAR). The suggestion for ISAR was a part of the verification system recommended in its draft CTBT presented in 1993 (CD/1232). **The United States** presented a working paper illustrating a possible concept for monitoring atmospheric radioactivity as part of the overall verification system for a CTBT. The concept aims at sampling the atmosphere on a global basis to search for debris, including radioactive particulates and gases, which might result from a nuclear explosion in the atmosphere, undergound or underwater.

Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts explains its third technical test (GSETT-3) of the concept it has developed for an International Seismic Monitoring System (ISMS). The Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban requested the Conference's Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to summarize the overall concept of GSETT-3, the function and components of the future system, and the organization and cost of the technical test. The Ad Hoc Group has done so in document CD/1254 of 25 March. The GSETT-3, which is already under way, but the main part of which will take place in 1995, should provide the practical experience and infrastructure which could be used by the Conference on Disarmament to establish a seismic monitoring system for a CTBT. The detailed report contains a three-page executive summary of its contents.

Sweden on scope and on-site inspections. Using its draft CTBT (CD/1232) as a basis, Sweden revised in one paper the language for the scope of application of the test ban and in another explained further its suggestions for the conduct of challenge, on-site inspections, and on-site monitoring of non-seismic explosions.

China forwards views on CTBT basic structure. In a list composed of a preamble and 27 additional items, China gave its ideas on the topics to be covered for the achievement of a CTBT. Its list is not exclusive, but represents to China those basic provisions of the treaty that will require "thorough and painstaking discussion and negotiation" in the Ad Hoc Committee (CD/1255).

Australia puts forward draft treaty elements. At the close of the first part of the Conference session, Australia set down on paper a full range of draft elements for a CTBT, containing language for 15 articles of the future treaty and a draft protocol on the organization, the global monitoring system and procedures for on-site inspection and monitoring. Australia provided in a separate paper an explanation of those draft treaty elements. The elements follow on a paper Australia submitted concerning on-site inspections and non-compliance.

United States moratorium

The United States representative to the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Stephen Ledogar, briefed a plenary meeting on 17 March on the decision adopted by the United States to continue its unilaterally declared moratorium on nuclear testing until September 1995. The moratorium was first declared by the U.S. Congress in October 1992, and extended by President Clinton in August 1993.

According to the White House statement on the subject, issued as Conference document **CD/1249**, the current decision was made by weighing the contribution that further tests would make to improving the safety and reliability of the United States arsenal in preparation for a CTBT against:

- The restraint other declared nuclear powers have shown in not responding to China's nuclear test last October with tests of their own;
- **The encouraging progress recorded in the CTBT negotations in Geneva** (emphasis added);
- The adverse implications further United States nuclear tests would have for its broader non-proliferation objectives, including securing the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty next year.

Special Coordinator on fissile material cut-off reports

On 31 March, at the last meeting of the Conference on Disarmament before a six-week break Ambassador Gerald Shannon of Canada, as Special Coordinator, reported that his consultations with members and non-members of the Conference revealed that "a preponderant majority" favoured the Conference on Disarmament as the most appropriate international forum to negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for weapons purposes, but that there was still no unanimity on the subject.

He reported also that many delegations believed that negotiations could be in the framework of an ad hoc committee of the Conference devoted to the item and that those negotiations could take place even while the Conference was negotiating a CTBT. He had also solicited views on such questions as the scope of an eventual agreement, the verification regime and the structure of the future treaty.

Technical hearings needed

In the course of his consultations, Ambassador Shannon found that the Conference needed to expand its base of technical knowledge. He suggested that a future ad hoc committee examine the technical side of the issue at an early stage and consider how to use the technical expertise and experience of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The ad hoc committee might, for example, decide to request the Agency to develop a verification package, or it might choose to establish an expert group under its own auspices, to meet in Geneva or Vienna. There had also been a suggestion that presentations by national experts be made before negotiations begin.

* * * *

"Working for peace and disarmament, we have reflected on our preferred vision of the future in this post-cold war era. We have envisioned not only what we want our world to look like, but also what our responsibilitites to it entail. We reject a world order based on violence, force, and coercion, and instead embrace one where cooperation, community, and the meeting of human needs form the foundation of human interaction. We urge the Conference on Disarmament to undertake its work with this vision in mind." Message to the plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament on 10 March presented by a group of nine non-governmental organizations on the occasion of International Women's Day 1994. The women's groups attending the meeting of the Conference seized the opportunity in the message to urge the Conference to widen NGO access to its work. They asked specifically that the Conference consider the possibility of granting NGOs access to the work of the ad hoc committees.

Monterey Institute sponsors Workshop on United Nations Register of Conventional Arms

The Program for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, in conjunction with the University of Bradford (United Kingdom) and the Bonn International Centre for Conversion, hosted a workshop from 6 to 9 April in Monterey, California, designed to assist the United Nations Group of Qualified Governmental Experts to review the continued operation and further development of the UN Register. That Group is meeting several times in 1994 (see Calendar back page) in order to prepare a report on the Register for the General Assembly at its 49th session this year.

A select group of governmental and non-governmental experts on conventional weapons and international security presented papers covering the main issues being addressed by the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts. The Institute will publish some of those papers. For information, contact Monterey Institute of International Studies, Program for Nonproliferation Studies, 425 Van Buren Street, Monterey, CA 93940, U.S.A. Fax: (408) 647-3519.

Disarmament Commission opens

The *United Nations Disarmament Commission* began it 1994 substantive session on 18 April and will continue until 9 May. It adopted the agenda agreed upon at its organizational meeting, which took place during the last General Assembly in 1993. The Commission has included in its agenda two items which it has considered for several years and which, according to its self-imposed rule, should, in principle, be concluded this year. One deals with nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons, and another with the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields. It has also added a new item entitled "International arms transfers, with particular reference to General Assembly resolution 46/36 H".

Process of nuclear disarmament in the framework of international peace and security, with the objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons

Ambassador Volodymyr D. Khandogy of Ukraine is continuing the chairmanship his country began last year of the Working Group dealing with this item and has presented a working paper (A/CN.10/185 of 20 April) on the subject.

Role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields

Ambassador Peggy Mason of Canada, who chaired the Drafting Group which formulated a set of draft guidelines and recommendations on the item in 1993 (Report of the Disarmament Commission to the 48th General Assembly, A/48/42), and is chairing the Working Group to continue work on those guidelines at this session, pointed out in her opening remarks to the Commission that the part of the agenda item causing the most disagreement dealt with the issue of transfer of sensitive dual use technologies. Her country was paying close attention to this item as it presented an opportunity to broaden international agreement in a particularly difficult area of non-proliferation efforts. While it was essential to find ways to ensure that technology developed for peaceful purposes did not find its way into the hands of those seeking to develop weapons of mass destruction or their means of delivery, she explained, at the same time, the application of such technologies for economic and social development should be encouraged.

New item: International arms transfers, with particular reference to General Assembly resolution 46/36 H

At the suggestion of Colombia, supported by many other States, the Commission agreed to add this new item to its agenda, which will be the first time that the Commission will examine the question of illicit arms transfers. Ambassador Luis Fernando Jaramillo of Colomiba is chairing the Working Group on the item. As a contribution to the debate, he presented a working paper containing a draft set of guidelines aimed at controlling and eventually eradicating the illicit arms trade (A/CN.10/184 of 22 March 1994).

* * * *

Biological Weapons Convention

The third Review Conference of the Parties to the 1972 *Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction*, which took place in September 1991, decided to establish an Ad Hoc Group of Governmental Experts, open to all States Parties, to identify and examine potential verification measures from a scientific and technical standpoint. The Convention, which had been negotiated, and signed and had entered into force during the cold war period, has been said by many States to be in need of strengthening as it lacks any means of international verification. The Group of Experts met for four sessions during 1992 and 1993, adopting a comprehensive report which identified 21 potential verification measures.

The report of the experts was circulated to all the States Parties and, as agreed at the third Review Conference, after a majority of States parties had asked the Depositary Governments—the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States—for the convening of a conference to examine the report, such a conference would be convened. That conference is responsible for deciding the fate of the Expert Group findings.

Preparatory Committee meets

A preparatory committee to organize a special conference of the States Parties to examine the Group of Experts' report was held in Geneva from 11 to 15 April 1994. Ambassador Tibor Tóth of Hungary, who had chaired the four expert group meetings, was appointed to chair the Preparatory Committee. It was also recommended that he preside over the Special Conference scheduled to take place in Geneva from 19 to 30 September 1994.

* * * *

The Disarmament Agenda of the International Community in 1994 and Beyond

The Centre for Disarmament has published two important statements of the Secretary-General made in January this year the title of which bespeaks their contents. Covering the most topical issues of disarmament today, the Secretary-General addressed the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters on 12 January and sent a message to the Conference on Disarmament as it opened its 1994 session on 25 January. A free copy of the publication has been included in this mailing of the Newsletter.

Inhumane Weapons Convention Review

As reported in the January-February issue of the *Newsletter*, the Group of Governmental Experts to prepare the review conference of the States Parties to the *Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects* met from 28 February to 4 March this year in Geneva, taking several important decisions on the organization of its work and the preparation of background documentation. Twenty-six of the 39 States Parties participated in the session and another 23 non-parties joined the exercise. The Group was not able to reach consensus on the participation in future sessions of United Nations agencies, specialized and other agencies, non-governmental organizations and competent individuals.

The Group held a general debate on its priority item, that is, the consideration of specific proposals for amendments to Protocol II for the purpose of strengthening restrictions on the use of anti-personnel mines and, in particular those without neutralizing or self-destroying mechanisms; the establishment of a verification system for Protocol II; and the possibility of broadening the scope of Protocol II to cover armed conflicts that are not of an international character.

A proposal was made to consider restrictions for sea mines (Protocol II currently applies only to the use of mines on land). Also proposed for the consideration of the Group of Experts was the inclusion of a prohibition on laser-blinding weapons under the Convention.

The Group is expected to report to the States Parties before the end of 1994 on the results of its work on amendments to Protocol II. To that end, it will meet in two more sessions this year in Geneva, from **16 to 27 May and from 8 to 19 August.** To allow additional time to consider proposals other than those related to Protocol II, the Group decided to consider the possibility of holding a fourth session in Geneva sometime in 1995.

The Group decided that three background documents should be prepared:

- A summary of negotiations leading to the conclusion of the Convention and subsequent developments (in preparation by the Secretariat);
- A paper giving the rationale for amending, and ways and means of improving, Protocol II, and on military and humanitarian perspectives for its amendment (in preparation by the ICRC);
- A paper on the rationale for considering other proposals relating to the Convention and its existing or future protocols (in preparation by the ICRC).

The meeting elected Mr. Johan Molander of Sweden to the chair. Since Mr. Molander was not available for the first session, Ambassador Lars Norberg of Sweden replaced him during that period. The contact point in the United Nations Secretariat is Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, Deputy Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

ICRC backs total ban on AP mines and laser-blinding weapons

The International Committee of the Red Cross, which is taking part as an observer in the Group of Governmental Experts to prepare the review conference of the Inhumane Weapons Convention and has been asked to prepare two substantial background papers for the Group, has declared its belief that, from a humanitarian point of view, the only truly effective restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons would be a world-wide ban on anti-personnel mines and on blinding as a method of warfare. It favoured extending the scope of application of the Inhumane Weapons Convention to internal armed conflicts and supported the development of practical means to enforce and control its implementation. (ICRC News-No. 8/24 February 1994)

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Africa

One of the direct results of the immense political changes that have taken place in the region of southern Africa, and in South Africa itself, especially the disclosure of the existence, destruction and subsequent verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency, of South Africa's nuclear weapons capability, has been the real possibility of achieving the goal embraced by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) since 1964 of the denuclearization of the entire African continent.

A Group of Governmental Experts, representing all regions of Africa, and in which South Africa participated as an observer, held three sessions in 1993 and presented to the 48th regular session of the General Assembly a *draft treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa.* The draft was appended to the report of the Group of Experts on its third meeting (document A/48/371 of 18 October 1994). The General Assembly at its 48th session in 1993 requested the United Nations Secretary-General to take appropriate action to enable the Group of Experts to meet during 1994 in Windhoek and Addis Ababa in order to finalize the drafting of the treaty.

In close cooperation with the OAU, the Group of Experts held its fourth session in Windhoek from 16 to 22 March and made further progress on the draft text. Representatives of the five nuclear-weapon States, which are expected to bear special responsibilites under protocols to the draft treaty, were invited to a special meeting of the gathering on 22 March. As foreseen by the General Assembly, a fifth meeting will take place in Addis Ababa from 11 to 14 May, with the aim of finalizing the draft treaty.

* * * *

Security in Central Africa

Political and ethnic tensions in Rwanda existed long before the explosion of violence that followed the crash of the airliner carrying the Presidents of Rwanda and Burundi on 6 April 1994. The subsequent chaotic events which began in Kigali and spread throughout Rwanda are now jeopardizing the peace and security of all of Rwanda's neighbors in this subregion of Central Africa. Along with the violence and political upheaval have come massive flights of refugees seeking safer ground across borders. Those events serve as a stark reminder of the need for measures to build institutional arrangements among the States of the region with a view to fostering confidence and security, resolving conflicts peacefully, developing subregional collective defence and putting the principles of preventive diplomacy into practice.

It was for those very purposes that the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) created in 1992, under United Nations auspices, a *Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa.*

At the same time as the events described above broke out in Kigali, the Standing Advisory Committee was holding its fourth meeting at the ministerial level, from 4 to 8 April 1994, in Yaoundé, Cameroon. Among the recommendations made, the Committee mandated its Bureau to bring to the attention of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Government of Rwanda the readiness of the Member States of ECCAS to participate in any international observation mission in that country.

The Standing Advisory Committee will meet again in August this year, in Yaoundé.

* * * *

Assuring the Success of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Extension Conference

was the title of a gathering of non-governmental organizations held at United Nations Headquarters on 20 and 21 April, sponsored by the NGO Committee on Disarmament in cooperation with the Centre for Disarmament Affairs. Introduced by a distinguished panel of current and former diplomats, experts and scholars, the topics covered were: the status of negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban; fissile cut-off and ending the production of nuclear weapons; how should the nuclear-weapon States pursue disarmament under the NPT; and NPT extension: problems and prospects. In cooperation with the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, the NGO Committee on Disarmament will be publishing excerpts from the conference. To obtain a copy, contact the NGO Committee on Disarmament, Inc., 777 UN Plaza, Room 3-B, New York, New York 1001722.

Note: **Responding to New Realities in Disarmament, Peace-building and Global Security,** a booklet containing excerpts from the UN Disarmament Week Symposium, held at the United Nations on 26 and 27 October 1993, sponsored by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, the UN Department of Public Information and the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, will appear shortly. For copies, contact the NGO Committee on Disarmament.

CALENDAR* *subject to change*

18 April-9 May	New York	Disarmament Commission
Future dates: December 1994—Organizational meeting		
11-14 May	Addis Ababa	Group of Governmental Experts to prepare the draft treaty on an African nuclear-weapon-free zone
16-27 May	Geneva	Group of governmental experts to prepare the review conference of the Inhumane Weapons Convention—Second session
Future dates: Third session: 8-19 August in Geneva		
16 May-1 July	Geneva	Conference on Disarmament—Second part
Future dates: Third part: 25 July-7 Sept. in Geneva		
24-27 May	Hiroshima	United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific Conference on Disarmament issues: Transparency in armaments
31 May-10 June	New York	Expert Group on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms pursuant to GA res. 46/36 L—Second session
Future dates: Third session: 25 July to 5 August in New York		
5-8 July	New York	Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters
11-22 July	New York	Group of governmental experts on verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification—Second session
.....August	Yaoundé	Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa
12-16 September	Geneva	Preparatory Committee for the 1995 NPT Conference Third session
Future dates: Fourth session: 23-27 January 1995 in New York and the NPT Conference from 17 April to 12 May 1995 in New York		
19-30 September	Geneva	Special Conference of the States Parties to the Biological Weapons Convention
20 September	New York	Opening of the 49th regular session of the General Assembly
24-30 October		Disarmament Week 1994

Additional copies of the *Newsletter* may be requested from Room 3151, United Nations Headquarters, New York, New York 10017, Fax. No. (212) 963-1121: from the Geneva Branch of the Centre at the Palais des Nations, CH-1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland, Fax. No. (41-22) 917-0034: from the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, B.P. 2705, Lomé, Togo, Fax. No. (011 228) 254-315: from the Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, Mcal.Blas Cerdeña 450, San Isidro, Lima, Peru, Fax. No. (5114) 418-735: or from the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, P.O. Box 107, Pulchowk, Kathmandu, Nepal, Fax. No. (977-01) 523-991.

DISARMAMENT *Newsletter* **is published by the United Nations Centre for Disarmament Affairs**
Volume 12, No. 2 **March- April 1994**

Printed on recycled paper